1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 3 TOMAS GARCIA-GUZMAN, 4 Petitioner(s), 5 NO. C09-803MJP v. 6 ORDER ON REPORT AND A. NEIL CLARK, RECOMMENDATION 7 Respondent(s). 8 9 The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed 10 1. Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 17) 11 2. Traverse/Objections to Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 18) 12 all attached declarations and exhibits, and the remainder of the record, makes the following ruling: 13 IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED, Respondent's motion 14 to dismiss is GRANTED, and this matter is DISMISSED. 15 **Discussion** 16 The facts are fully briefed in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (R&R, pp. 17 2-3), and Petitioner concedes that they are "by and large correct." Objns., p. 1. The Court will not 18 repeat them here. 19 Petitioner has been declared a removable alien and is currently in custody awaiting the results 20 of his Ninth Circuit appeal. His Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Dkt. No. 6) seeks the following 21 relief: 22 That the Court Order the Petitioner to be released on supervised release pending all 23 finality or that the court orders the Agency to hold a bond hearing where individual factors are considered that can allow for the release of the Petitioner pending the 24 conclusion of his legal matters with ICE and the District Courts and the Ninth Circuit. 25 ORDER ON RPT &

26

**RECOMMEND'N - 1** 

Pet'n, p. 2 (emphasis supplied).

As outlined in the facts contained in the R&R, Petitioner has received four bond hearings. At the last bond hearing at which Petitioner appeared (which was his third bond hearing; he withdrew his request for the fourth hearing after the fourth hearing was already set), his bond was lowered from \$15,000 to \$2,500. AR R80-89. Petitioner filed this writ prior to his bond being reduced. In addition to his request in the alternative that he either be granted supervised release "or that the court orders the Agency to hold a bond hearing," the Court also notes that the writ contains the representation that "Petitioner does assert the fact that he is not able to afford a large bond, but may be able to gain assistance from the community in gaining access to a low bond." Pet'n, p. 6.

The R&R recommends the dismissal of the petition on the grounds that Petitioner has obtained the relief he sought – a bond review which resulted in a substantially lower bond. Petitioner's objection to the recommendation is confined to the failure to grant him supervised release without the necessity of a bond. But the writ of habeas corpus only sought supervised release in the alternative, and Petitioner has obtained one form of relief he requested. The granting of supervised release is a discretionary act, and nowhere in his objections does Petitioner allege an abuse of that discretion. Petitioner cites to no authority, nor is the Court aware of any, that requires a grant of supervised release under his circumstances as a matter of right.

## Conclusion

Petitioner has obtained the relief he sought by his writ of habeas corpus. The Respondent's motion to dismiss is GRANTED, and the petition filed in the above-entitled matter is DISMISSED.

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel and to Judge Donohue.

Dated: November \_\_18\_\_\_, 2009

Marsha J. Pechman U.S. District Judge

ausluf Helens